

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-12, 14-18, 29-37, and 43-50 are currently pending in the application. Claims 1-12, 14-18, 29-37, and 43 are rejected in the Advisory Action. Claims 6-9, 15-18, and 34-37 are indicated as allowable in the Final Office Action. Claims 1, 6-10, 15-18, 29, 34-37, and 43 are amended. Claims 44-50 are newly added. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-5, 10-12, 14, 29-33, and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lind et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0152508A1), referred to herein as Lind.

Lind describes a method and a system for conducting a bingo game. In the method, a player must either hit a daub button on a player station or a daub button defined on a player station touch screen to daub a plurality of numbers they have covered on the player's card and claim a prize (paragraph 85). If the player fails to daub the player's card within a specified short time period (3-10 seconds), any prizes the player may have won during the bingo game are forfeited to a progressive prize or to a fund that is given to a charity (paragraph 85). If the player has not covered a prize-winning pattern, skipping the daub step has no effect (paragraph 85).

Lind does not describe or suggest a method for conducting a wagering game as recited in claim 1. Specifically, Lind does not describe or suggest "determining a total interim pattern award amount for the player corresponding to a difference between the individual interim pattern awards for the interim patterns matched on the player's unique game array, wherein each of the individual interim pattern awards is greater than zero" and "adding at least a portion of the total interim pattern award amount to a progressive jackpot pool if the player does not input at least one prize claiming input to claim at least one of the interim pattern awards within at least one of the sleep time periods" as recited in claim 1. Rather, in contrast, Lind describes forfeiting any prizes a player may have won during a bingo game to a progressive jackpot if the player fails to daub the player's card within a specified short time period (paragraph 85). Hence, there is no calculation of the difference to determine the total interim pattern award amount. Accordingly, Lind does not describe or suggest "adding at least a portion of the total interim pattern award amount to a progressive jackpot pool if the player does not input at least one prize claiming input to claim at least one of the interim pattern awards within at least one of the sleep time periods" as recited in claim 1, where the total interim pattern amount corresponds to the difference between

the individual interim pattern awards for the interim patterns matched on the player's unique game array.

Claims 2-5 depend from independent claim 1. When the recitations of claims 2-5 are considered in combination with the recitations of claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2-5 are also patentable over Lind.

Lind does not describe or suggest a method for conducting a wagering game as recited in claim 10. Specifically, for at least the same reasons set forth above, Lind does not describe or suggest "configuring the gaming unit to determine a total interim pattern award amount for the player corresponding to a difference between the individual interim pattern awards for the interim patterns matched on the player's unique game array, wherein each of the individual interim pattern awards is greater than zero" and "configuring the gaming unit to transmit a message to a progressive jackpot network computer to add at least a portion of the total interim pattern award amount to a progressive jackpot pool if the player does not input at least one prize claiming input within at least one of the sleep time periods" as recited in claim 10. Hence, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 10 is patentable over Lind.

Claims 11, 12, and 14 depend from independent claim 10. When the recitations of claims 11, 12, and 14 are considered in combination with the recitations of claim 10, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 11, 12, and 14 are also patentable over Lind.

Further, Lind does not describe or suggest a gaming unit as recited in claim 29. Specifically, for at least the same reasons set forth above, Lind does not describe or suggest "the gaming unit controller being programmed to determine a total interim pattern award amount for the player corresponding to difference between the individual interim pattern awards for the interim patterns matched on the player's unique game array, wherein each of the individual interim pattern awards is greater than zero" and "the gaming unit controller being programmed to transmit a message to a progressive jackpot network computer to add at least a portion of the total interim pattern award amount to a progressive jackpot pool in response to not detecting input by the player within at least one of the sleep time periods" as recited in claim 29. Hence, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 29 is patentable over Lind.

Claims 30-33 depend from independent claim 29. When the recitations of claims 30-33 are considered in combination with the recitations of claim 29, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 30-33 are also patentable over Lind.

Further, Lind does not describe or suggest a computer readable medium including computer program code as recited in claim 43. Specifically, for at least the reasons set forth above, Lind does not describe or suggest the computer-readable medium comprising a plurality of instructions configured to direct the processor to “determine a total interim pattern award amount for the player corresponding to a difference between the individual interim pattern awards for the interim patterns matched on the player’s unique game array, wherein each of the individual interim pattern awards is greater than zero” and “add at least a portion of the total interim pattern award amount to a progressive jackpot pool if the player does not input at least one prize claiming input to claim at least one of the interim pattern awards within at least one of the sleep time periods”. Hence, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 43 is patentable over Lind.

Claims 6-9, 15-18, and 34-37 were objected to in the Final Office Action as being dependent upon a rejected based claim, but are allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants have amended claims 6-9, 15-18, and 34-37 to include the recitations of the corresponding independent claims and respectfully submit that claims 6-9, 15-18, and 34-37 are in condition for allowance.

Claim 44 depends from independent claim 1, which is submitted to patentable over the cited art. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 44 is also patentable over the cited art.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited art does not describe or suggest a method for conducting a wagering game and an associated progressive jackpot as recited in claim 45. Specifically, Applicants respectfully submit that Lind does not describe or suggest “adding a progressive jackpot contribution equal to the second interim pattern award amount minus the first interim pattern award amount to the progressive jackpot pool if the player does not input the prize claiming input within the second sleep time period and the second interim pattern award amount is greater than the first interim pattern award amount” as recited in claim 45. Further, claim 45 is similar to a portion of claim 7, which is allowable.

Further, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited art does not describe or suggest a method for conducting a wagering game and an associated progressive jackpot as recited in claim 46. Specifically, Applicants respectfully submit that Lind does not describe or suggest “adding a progressive jackpot contribution equal to the first interim pattern award amount minus

the second interim pattern award amount to the progressive jackpot pool if the player does not input the prize claiming input within the first sleep time period and the first interim pattern award amount is greater than the second interim pattern award amount” as recited in claim 46. Further, claim 46 is similar to a portion of claim 9, which is allowable.

Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited art does not describe or suggest a method for conducting a wagering game and an associated progressive jackpot as recited in claim 47. Specifically, Applicants respectfully submit that Lind does not describe or suggest “configuring the gaming unit to transmit a message to a progressive jackpot network computer to add a progressive jackpot contribution equal to the second interim pattern award amount minus the first interim pattern award amount to the progressive jackpot pool if the player does not input the prize claiming input within the second sleep time period and the second interim pattern award amount is greater than the first interim pattern award amount” as recited in claim 47. Further, claim 47 is similar to a portion of claim 16, which is allowable.

Additionally, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited art does not describe or suggest a method for conducting a wagering game and an associated progressive jackpot as recited in claim 48. Specifically, Applicants respectfully submit that Lind does not describe or suggest “configuring the gaming unit to transmit a message to a progressive jackpot network computer to add a progressive jackpot contribution equal to the first interim pattern award amount minus the second interim pattern award amount to the progressive jackpot pool if the player does not input the prize claiming input within the first sleep time period and the first interim pattern award amount is greater than the second interim pattern award amount” as recited in claim 48. Further, claim 48 is similar to a portion of claim 18, which is allowable.

Further, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited art does not describe or suggest a gaming unit for conducting a wagering game and an associated progressive jackpot as recited in claim 49. Specifically, Applicants respectfully submit that Lind does not describe or suggest “the gaming unit controller being programmed to transmit a message to a progressive jackpot network computer to add a progressive jackpot contribution equal to the second interim pattern award amount minus the first interim pattern award amount to the progressive jackpot pool in response to not detecting input by the player within the second sleep time period and determining that the second interim pattern award amount is greater than the first interim pattern award amount” as recited in claim 49. Also, claim 49 is similar to a portion of claim 35, which is allowable.

Further, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited art does not describe or suggest a gaming unit for conducting a wagering game and an associated progressive jackpot as recited in claim 50. Specifically, Applicants respectfully submit that Lind does not describe or suggest “the gaming unit controller being programmed to transmit a message to a progressive jackpot network computer to add a progressive jackpot contribution equal to the first interim pattern award amount minus the second interim pattern award amount to the progressive jackpot pool in response to not detecting input by the player within the second sleep time period and determining that the first interim pattern award amount is greater than the second interim pattern award amount” as recited in claim 50. Also, claim 50 is similar to a portion of claim 37, which is allowable. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 45-50 are patentable over the cited art and are in condition for allowance.

Applicants further respectfully submit that the Examiner has not initialed the references in an Information Disclosure Statement submitted to the United States Patent Office on December 20, 2007. MPEP §609 describes “[t]he initials of the examiner placed adjacent to the citations on the ** PTO/SB/08A and 08B or its equivalent mean that the information has been considered by the examiner to the extent noted above”. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner initial, besides each reference, that the reference is considered.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this application are in condition for allowance. Early favorable consideration of this Amendment is earnestly solicited and Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at (510) 663-1100.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Roger S. Sampson /

Roger S. Sampson

Registration No. 44314

Weaver Austin Villeneuve & Sampson LLP